arXiv:1611.06133v3 [astro-ph.EP] 22 Dec 2016

Effects of variable eccentricity on the climate of an Earth-like world

M.J. Way[1]

NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, 2880 Broadway, New York, NY 10025, USA

Michael.J.Way@nasa.gov

and

Nikolaos Georgakarakos

New York University Abu Dhabi, Saadiyat Island, PO Box 129188, Abu Dhabi, UAE

ABSTRACT

The Kepler era of exoplanetary discovery has presented the Astronomical community with a cornucopia of planetary systems very different from the one which we inhabit. It has long been known that Jupiter plays a major role in the orbital parameters of Mars and it's climate, but there is also a long-standing belief that Jupiter would play a similar role for Earth if not for its large moon. Using a three dimensional general circulation model (3-D GCM) with a fully-coupled ocean we simulate what would happen to the climate of an Earth-like world if Mars did not exist, but a Jupiter-like planet was much closer to Earth's orbit. We investigate two scenarios that involve evolution of the Earth-like planet's orbital eccentricity from 0–0.283 over 6500 years, and from 0–0.066 on a time scale of 4500 years. In both cases we discover that they would maintain relatively temperate climates over the time-scales simulated. More Earth-like planets in multi-planet systems will be discovered as we continue to survey the skies and the results herein show that the proximity of large gas giant planets may play an important role in the habitability of these worlds. These are the first such 3-D GCM simulations using a fully-coupled ocean with a planetary orbit that evolves over time due to the presence of a giant planet.

Subject headings: Astrobiology, planets and satellites: terrestrial planets, planets and satellites: atmospheres, planets and satellites: oceans, planets and satellites: dynamical evolution and stability.

[1]Department of Physics and Astronomy, Uppsala University, Uppsala, 75120, Sweden

1. Introduction

The Kepler era has demonstrated a plethora of planetary systems whose orbital configurations are quite unlike those of our own solar system.[1] The discovery of planets of similar mass and size to those of the Earth has ignited a strong interest in modeling the possibility of worlds in such system's habitable zones (HZ). As of November 2016 there are 31 planets[2] with masses less than 2.5 $M_\oplus$ with eccentricities larger than 0.1, albeit with relatively large errors bars in each quantity for most objects. Of these 6 are in multi-planet systems. Using a different criteria Bolmont et al. (2016) find four possible terrestrial type planets with a non-negligible percentage of their orbit in the HZ for eccentricities greater than 0.1. More such systems will be discovered in the future and it is likely that there will exist cases where a Jupiter-like planet may be influencing the orbital parameters of an Earth-like terrestrial world more so than in the current day Earth-Jupiter case. Understanding variations such as eccentricity and polar obliquity (θ_p) will be important for the climate and habitability potential of a terrestrial planet in such a system. For example, the effect Jupiter has on the eccentricity and obliquity states of Mars are well known (Ward & Rudy 1991; Laskar et al. 2004; Armstrong et al. 2004), but Jupiter also has an effect on Earth (Spiegel et al. 2010, hereafter SP2010) which we see as part of the Milankovich cycles (Milankovich 1941). At the same time some studies show that Earth's large moon offers it more obliquity stability against Jupiter's influence (e.g. Laskar et al. 1993) and may be a requirement for climate stability and life (e.g. Waltham 2004), although Lissauer et al. (2011) claim it is not as important as previously thought. In fact Jupiter plays a role in the present-day orbital dynamics of Venus, Earth and Mars, but it may also have played a role in their formation and size (e.g. Fritz et al. 2014; Batygin & Laughlin 2015). This will be no less true for similar or more "tightly packed" extrasolar planetary systems.

The effects of the orbital eccentricity and the obliquity of an Earth-like planet have been investigated in several studies. Williams & Pollard (2002) (hereafter WP2002) used a 3-D General Circulation Model (GCM) and a 1-D Energy Balance Model (EBM) to show that the "average stellar flux received over an entire orbit, not the length of the time spent within the HZ" determine the long-term climate stability of systems with a broad range of eccentricities (0.1–0.7). All of their simulations used a semi-major axis of 1 Astronomical Unit (AU) for the Earth-like planet. They found that one avoids reaching the moist greenhouse and runaway greenhouse limits as long as eccentricities are less than 0.42 and 0.70 respectively. A 3-D GCM was also used by the same authors for investigating the effects that various θ_p angles may have on the climate of an Earth-like planet (Williams & Pollard 2003). They concluded that most Earth-like planets should be hospitable to life at high obliquity. None of their simulated planets were warm enough to develop a runaway greenhouse or cold enough to freeze over completely. The recent study by Bolmont et al. (2016), while not directly comparable to that herein because of their model choices, is nonetheless interesting. They investigated the effectiveness of the mean flux approximation as previously studied

[1] http://exoplanet.eu/diagrams/

[2] http://exoplanet.eu/

by WP2002. However, their setup was distinct: they ran 3-D GCM simulations using 3 different stellar luminosities ($L_\star$=$L_\odot$,$10^{-2}L_\odot$, $10^{-4}L_\odot$), with a range of semi-major axes, fixed eccentricities and orbital periods while keeping θ_p=0. All systems were in a 1:1 spin-orbit resonance. They concluded "that the higher the eccentricity and the higher the luminosity of the star, the less reliable the mean flux approximation."

Dressing et al. (2010) (hereafter D2010) used an EBM to examine how different fixed values of eccentricity, θ_p, azimuthal obliquity, ocean fraction, and rotation rate of a terrestrial type world might affect climate. They also explored the transition to a snowball state by reducing the stellar luminosity. They found that the polar regions at higher eccentricities (where θ_p=23.5° was kept fixed) receive more mean insolation and the regional habitability fraction increased. The result is clear: if Earth had a larger orbital eccentricity it may have had even larger areas of habitability than it does today (see Section 3 for direct comparison to this work). They also showed that the outer edge of the HZ expands with values of eccentricity 0.4-0.7. The findings of D2010 confirm the GCM results of WP2002 in that increasing the eccentricity of a terrestrial world can increase the allowed semi-major axis for the outer edge of the HZ. D2010 also note that as one increases eccentricity regional and seasonal variability also increase in amplitude leading to "a more gradual transition from habitable to non-habitable planets with increasing semi-major axis."

A companion paper to that of D2010 is by SP2010 who use the same EBM as in D2010, but have no 3-D GCM simulations. The focus in SP2010 is slightly different as much of the paper examines what sorts of eccentricities are required to 'break out' of a cold-start condition like that of a snowball state. At the same time it is one of the few papers to consider the effects of *variable eccentricity* on long-term climatic habitability.

Other recent studies regarding habitable worlds include Linsenmeier et al. (2015) who used a GCM to explore the effects of seasonal variability for the climate of Earth-like planets as determined by θ_p and orbital eccentricity and Armstrong et al. (2014) who used an EBM to study the impact of obliquity variations on planetary habitability in hypothetical systems. Ferreira et al. (2014) use a 3-D GCM to investigate high obliquity states with a fully coupled ocean in the context of an aquaworld. They explore three obliquities (23.5, 54 and 90°) and find in all cases that their world still appears to be habitable.

In this work, we investigate the effects on the climate of an Earth-like planet whose orbit is perturbed by the presence of a nearby giant planet. For the first time, a GCM coupled with analytical equations that describe the orbital evolution of a terrestrial planet are used. An additional major difference between our work and previous studies is that we utilize a fully-coupled ocean model and an Earth continental layout. This is in contrast to WP2002 who used a 50 meter "thermodynamic slab" ocean model without horizontal ocean heat transport or Linsenmeier et al. (2015) who used an aquaplanet model and a 50m slab ocean, but again with no horizontal ocean heat transport. We use a fully-coupled ocean model because alongside atmospheric heat transport, ocean heat transport plays a vital role in the climate of Earth (Peixoto & Oort 1992). In particular

the work of Hu & Yang (2014) has shown that the effects of a fully coupled ocean versus a shallow slab ocean can be significant when looking at syncrononously rotating worlds around M-dwarf stars. Godolt et al. (2015) demonstrated stark differences for planets orbiting F-type stars when changing ocean heat transport while Rose (2015) has nicely demonstrated the climatic effects of changing ocean heat transport equations for aqua and ridge type worlds. The downside of a fully-coupled ocean approach is that it can take hundreds of model years for a fully-coupled ocean to come into equilibrium with the atmosphere, yet it will provide a more accurate picture of the climate of the world being modeled. We focus this study on the effects that the terrestrial planet's orbital eccentricity has on the planet's climate, which is an under-researched area in 3-D GCM studies. At the same time we keep θ_p=23.5° as for modern Earth. The latter is a necessary requirement for comparing with past and future work in the literature since obliquity plays such an important role in the possible climate states of terrestrial planets.

2. Methods

Our terrestrial planet climate simulations utilize the Goddard Institute for Space Studies 3-D GCM known as Model E2 (Schmidt et al. 2014). The version used for this work is referred to as ROCKE3D[3] (Way et al. 2017). ROCKE3D has extensions to Model E2 to allow for a larger range of temperatures, different atmospheric constituents, topographies, rotation rates and variable eccentricity in time. An Earth-like topography is used for the atmospheric simulations herein, but with modest changes from present day Earth to make the model more robust to possibly extreme conditions encountered by the perturbed orbits modeled. The model is run on a 4x5° latitude-longitude grid with 20 vertical atmospheric layers with the top set to 0.1hPa. A 13 layer fully coupled ocean is utilized, but is a simplified 'bathtub' type of ocean topography with depths along coasts of 591 meters, and 1360 meters elsewhere.[4] The shallower ocean allows the model to attain thermodynamic equilibrium more quickly than it would if using an actual Earth ∼5000 meter depth ocean. Some shallow basins were also filled in such as Hudson Bay, the Mediterranean, the Baltic Sea, and the Black Sea. A number of straits were opened up, like that north of Baffin Bay and those north of Australia. The same solar insolation at 1AU used for Earth studies is used here. The atmospheric constituents and green house gas amounts are the same as modern day Earth with 984mb of atmospheric pressure at the surface. The θ_p angle and rotation rate are also the same as modern day Earth. ROCKE3D does not take into account the resolved effects of non-dilute species, although it does take this into account in determining parcel buoyancy in the cumulus parameterization. Water vapor is the largest potential problem in this regard. However, not until the water vapor becomes greater than 10-15% of the mass does it start to become problematic as pointed out in Pierrehumbert & Ding (2016) and we do not reach this limit in any of the simulations

[3]Resolving Orbital and Climate Keys of Earth and Extraterrestrial Environments with Dynamics

[4]The ocean depth numbers correspond to specific ocean layers in the model.

presented herein (see Section 3).

In order to model the orbital evolution of the Earth-like planet, we make use of the work by Georgakarakos et al. (2016). This study, which builds on previous results (e.g. Georgakarakos 2003; Georgakarakos & Eggl 2015), focuses on the long term orbital evolution of a terrestrial planet under the gravitational influence of a Jupiter-like world with the latter relatively close to the former. The analytical equations for the orbital motion of the Earth-like planet derived in Georgakarakos et al. (2016) are used to provide eccentricity and pericentre values for the 3-D GCM simulations herein. In the context of this work, all bodies are treated as point masses, they lie on the same plane of motion and the system is not close to a mean motion resonance.

We simulated two different climate evolution scenarios as outlined in Table 1. Unlike the previous studies mentioned in the Introduction we were not able to run as many parameters ensembles given the length of time it takes the GCM to run one secular period of the Earth-like planet's motion (see column 9 in Table 1). The GCM initial conditions are the same as modern Earth surface and ocean temperature values, unlike that of SP2010 who start many of their simulations in a snowball state and then examine how differing eccentricities might pull the world out of that state and into a possibly more temperate one. As mentioned above, we maintain a fixed Earth-like polar obliquity (θ_p=$\theta_\oplus$) to make it more directly comparable to modern day Earth. Certainly a broader range of obliquities need to be considered in the future, not to mention the possible coupling of variable obliquity with variable eccentricity whose values are driven by work similar to that in Georgakarakos et al. (2016).

3. Results and Discussion

There are a number of interesting similarities and differences between the results herein and that of WP2002 (the work that most closely corresponds to ours). We show, as demonstrated in WP2002, that relative humidity and precipitation increase with increasing temperature (Figures 1 and 2 plots F and G) when the planet is near periastron for a given orbit at the higher eccentricities shown in Figures 1D and 2D.

These effects are more pronounced for Case 1 (shown in Figure 1) because of the higher eccentricities achieved. The planetary mean relative humidity for the first layer of the atmosphere for Case 1 as shown in Figure 1F when the planet is near periastron for a given orbit is quite a bit

Table 1: Simulations

Case	Jupiter		Earth				runtime	
	eccentricity	semimajor axis	eccentricity	obliquity	orbital/rotation period	semimajor axis	model years	wall clock
1	0.27	2.15	variable	23°	365d/24hr	1.00	7000	108 days
2	0.05	1.80	variable	23°	365d/24hr	1.00	5000	62 days



Fig. 1.— Case 1 from Table 1. Solid black lines are a 10 year running mean. Plot A is the mean *Surface Air Temperature* for the Earth-like planet. B is the *Planetary Albedo* in percentage. C is the amount of *Incident Solar Flux* the planet receives in Watts per meter squared. D is the *Orbital Eccentricity* as a function of time. Plot E is the globally averaged *Specific Humidity* at 100mb (the top layer of our GCM atmosphere) given in units of kilograms of H_2O per kilogram of air. F is the surface air *Relative Humidity* (the lowest atmospheric layer in our GCM). G is the *Precipitation* in mm per day, while plot F is the *Ocean Ice Fraction* defined as the percentage of the ocean that is covered in ice.



Fig. 2.— Case 2 from Table 1. All ordinates are the same as for Case 1 except for plots C and E that have been adusted to allow for more visible detail.

higher than present day Earth (∼73%). The precipitation in Figure 1G goes to higher values than the average modern Earth value of ∼3 mm/day (Legates & Willmott 2008). Higher than modern day Earth specific humidities in the top atmospheric layer (less than $2\text{x}10^{-6}$kg H_2O / kg AIR) for Case 1 also manifest themselves in Figure 1E and Figure 3A, but they are two orders of magnitude

below the Kasting (1988) moist-greenhouse limit (the "Kasting limit") near each periastron crossing when the eccentricities are at their highest. It should be noted that at model year 3359, when the highest eccentricity and solar insolation is reached at periastron, the max gridpoint temperature was 53.9°C (see Figure 4A). This is within the range of validity of the ROCKE3D GCM radiation scheme. WP2002 state that their eccentricity limit for a moist-greenhouse state is 0.42, but in Case 1 (Figure 1E and 3A) it is clear that at our max eccentricity of 0.283 we are very var from approaching a moist-greenhouse state. In neither Case 1 or 2 are these worlds anywhere near the moist greenouse limit as evidenced in Figure 1E and 2E. No individual grid cell in either case approaches the moist greenhouse limit at periastron. For Case 1 the highest monthly averaged specific humidity achieved in a given grid cell at 100mb at periastron for the highest eccentricity achieved is 6.7×10^{-5} kg H_2O / kg AIR (Figure 3A). While this is nearly 3 times the max globally averaged monthly value plotted in Figure 1E, it is still nearly 1.5 orders of magnitude lower than the moist greenhouse limit. As mentioned in Section 2 ROCKE3D does not into account the resolved effects of non-dilute species. For Case 1 we quantified this effect for water vapor at the highest eccentricity achieved, 0.283. We looked at 30 min intervals (our Physics time-step) over the month around periastron. The highest surface specific humidity found was nearly 0.048 kg H_2O/kg AIR. This corresponds to less than 5% of the mass of the atmosphere, and therefore should not be a significant source of error.

The closest simulation in WP2002 to our Case 1 at maximum eccentricity is their run "GCM 2" which has a fixed eccentricity of 0.3. Their mean surface temperature is 22.90°C, which is very close to our Case 1 22.5°C for our largest eccentricity near orbital periastron. This gives us confidence that our results are consistent with WP2002 in some ways.

As in WP2002 our albedo and ocean ice fraction in Case 1 (Figure 1B and 1H) show some interesting behavior (it is more difficult to discern in Case 2). At higher eccentricities the ocean ice fraction decreases at the same time that the spread in albedos is largest. Surely this is related to the world's ability to keep the ocean ice fraction low at high eccentricities even at apoastron. This is likely a side effect of the bulk heat capacity of our temperate world (Cowan et al. 2012). It is also due to our fully coupled ocean's horizontal heat transport and the relatively short amount of time Case 1 spends at its farthest extent from the Sun.

D2010 also discuss the importance of model relaxation in their Appendix. We have also tested this, which is necessary given that we have a fully coupled ocean rather than their shallow 50 meter slab ocean. Using a 10 year running mean we found that the net radiative balance for our world was within +/- 0.2 Watts m^{-2} for the entirety of Simulation 1 and 2. This demonstrates that even for our most rapidly changing world (Simulation 1) it is not changing fast enough to throw the planet's radiative balance off enough to affect our results.


Case 1 e=0.283 Perastron Specific Humidity at 100mb (kg H2O/kg AIR)
0.0E+00 1.3E-05 2.7E-05 4.0E-05 5.4E-05 6.7E-05
Case 1 e=0.283 Apoastron Specific Humidity at 100mb (kg H2O/kg AIR)
0.0E+00 2.6E-06 5.2E-06 7.8E-06 1.0E-05 1.3E-05

Fig. 3.— Case 1 Specific Humidity at 100mb at Periastron (left) and Apoastron (right). Note that the scale of the figures is different. The Apoastron limits are 1/5 the limits of those for Periastron.


Case 1 e=0.283 Periastron Surface Air Temperature (Celsius)
-86 -58 -30 -2 26 54
Case 1 e=0.283 Apoastron Surface Air Temperature (Celsius)
-86 -58 -30 -2 26 54

Fig. 4.— Case 1 surface temperatures at Periastron (left) and Apoastron (right). The gridding corresponds to the GCM lat-lon resolution used (4x5°).

4. Conclusion

With upcoming space missions such as the Transiting Exoplanet Survey Satellite (Ricker et al. 2014), the James Webb Space Telescope (Gardner et al. 2006) and large ground based observatories such as the European Extremely Large Telescope (Gilmozzi & Spyromillio 2007) systems similar to those described herein are likely to be discovered. Prior to follow-up observations, which may be costly in terms of telescope observing time, it will be important to contrain any evolution in the orbital parameters of worlds like those of Case 1 whose regional habitability may be larger than other potential candidates. We have not discussed the evolution of polar orbital inclination of the Earth-like planet in this work, but other 3-D GCM studies (e.g. Williams & Pollard (2003); Linsenmeier et al. (2015)) have shown that it plays an additional role in the habitability states of

worlds like those we have modeled in this work. Future studies in this series will include polar orbital inclination evolution to better understand its effects in combination with eccentricity. Rotation rate will also be examined since it is clear that it plays a very important role in understanding the extent of the HZ (Iro & Deming 2010; Yang et al. 2014).

Thanks goes to Thomas P. Clune for his help in getting the ROCKE3D model to handle variable eccentricity worlds and to Tony Del Genio and the GISS ROCKE3D NExSS team for comments and suggestions on this manuscript. Special thanks goes to the referee Dorian Abbott for suggestions that improved the manuscript. The results reported herein benefited from participation in NASAs Nexus for Exoplanet System Science research coordination network sponsored by NASAs Science Mission Directorate.

This research has made use of NASA's Astrophysics Data System Bibliographic Services.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, J C., Leovy, C.B. & Quinn, T. 2004 Icarus, 171, 2, 255

Armstrong J.C., Barnes R., Domagal-Goldman S., Breiner J., Quinn T.R. & Meadows V.S. 2014, Astrobiology, 14(4): 277-291. doi:10.1089/ast.2013.1129.

Batygin, K. & Laughlin, G. 2015, PNAS, 112, 14, 4214, doi:10.1073/pnas.1423252112

Bolmont, E., Libert, A., Leconte, J. & Selsis, F. 2016, å, 591, A106, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201628073

Cowan, N.B., Voigt, A. & Abbot, D.S. 2012, ApJ, 757, 80, doi:10.1088/0004-637X/757/1/80

Dressing, C.D., Spiegel, D.S., Scharf, C.A., Menou, K. & Raymond, S.N. 2010, ApJ, 721, 1295, doi:10.1088/0004-637X/721/2/1295

Ferreira, D., Marshall, J. O'Gorman, P.A. & Seager, S. 2014, Icarus, 236-248, doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2014.09.015

Fritz, J., Bitsch, B., Kuhrt, E., Morbidelli, A., Tornow, C., Wunnemann, K., Fernandes, V.A., Grenfell, J.L., Rauer, H., Wagner, R., Werner, S.C. 2014, Planetary and Space Science, 98, 254, doi:10.1016/j.pss.2014.03.003

Gardner, J. P., Mather, J. C., Clampin, M., et al. 2006, Space Sci Rev, 123, 485

Georgakarakos, N. 2003, MNRAS, 345, 1, 340, doi:10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.06942.x

Georgakarakos, N. & Eggl, S. 2015, ApJ, 802, 2, 94, doi:10.1088/0004-637X/802/2/94

Georgakarakos, N., Dobbs-Dixon, I., Way, M.J. 2016, MNRAS, 461, 2, 1512, doi:10.1093/mnras/stw1378

Godolt, M., Grenfell, J. L., Hamann-Reinus, A., et al. 2015, Planet. Space Sci., 111, 62

Gilmozzi, R. & Spryromillio, J. 2007, Messenger, 127, 11-19

Hu, Y. & Yang, J. 2014, PNAS, 111, 2, 629, doi:10.1073/pnas.1315215111

Iro, N. & Deming, L.D. 2010, ApJ, 712, 218, doi:10.1088/0004-637X/712/1/218

Kasting, J.F. 1988, Icarus, 74, 472494.

Laskar, J., Joutel, F., & Robutel, P. 1993, Nature 361, 6413, 615-617, doi:10.1038/361615a0

Laskar, J., Correia, A. C. M., Gastineau, M., Joutel, F., Levrard, B. & Robutel, P. 2004, Icarus 170, 343, doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2004.04.005

Legates, D.R. & Willmott, C.J. 1990, Int. J. Climatol., 10: 111-127, doi:10.1002/joc.3370100202

Linsenmeier, M., Pascale, M., Lucarini, V. 2015, Planetary and Space Science, 105, 43, doi:10.1016/j.pss.2014.11.003

Lissauer, J.J., Barnes, J.W. & Chambers, J.E. 2011, Icarus. 217: 7787, doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2011.10.013

Milankovitch, M. 1941, Kanon der Erdbestrahlung und seine Anwendung auf das Eiszeitenproblem (Belgrade: Mihaila Curcica)

Peixoto, J. & Oort, A. 1992, Physics of Climate, Am Inst Phys, NY, 520 pp.

Pierrehumbert, R.T. & Ding, F. 2016, Proc of the Royal Soc of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 472, 2190, 1364-5021, doi:10.1098/rspa.2016.0107

Ricker, G. R., Winn, J. N., Vanderspek, R., et al. 2014, in P. SPIE, Vol. 9143, Space Telescopes and Instrumentation 2014: Optical, Infrared, and Millimeter Wave, 914320

Rose, B.E.J. 2015, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 120, doi:10.1002/2014JD022659

Schmidt, G. A., et al. 2014, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 6, no.1, 141-184, doi:10.1002/2013MS000265.

Spiegel, D. S., Menou, K. & Scharf, C. A. 2008, ApJ, 681, 1609

Spiegel, D.S., Raymond, S.N., Dressing, C.D., Scharf, C.A., & Mitchell, J.L. 2010, ApJ, 721:13081318.

Waltam, D. 2004, Astrobiology, 4, 4, 460

Ward, W.R. & Rudy, D.J. 1991, Icarus, 94, 160

Way, M.J. et al. 2016, to be submitted to ApJS

Williams, D.M. & Pollard, D. 2002, International Journal of Astrobiology 1:61, doi:10.1017/S1473550402001064

Williams, D.M. & Pollard, D. 2003, International Journal of Astrobiology 2:119. doi:10.1017/S1473550403001356

Yang, J., Boue, G., Fabrycky, D.C. & Abbot, D.S. 2013 ApJ, 787, L2, doi:10.1088/2041-8205/787/1/L2

This preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.2.